DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 409 736 FL 024 676

AUTHOR	Furumoto, Mitchell A.
TITLE	Foreign Language Planning in U.S. Higher Education: The Case of a Graduate Business Program.
PUB DATE	97
NOTE	16p.; For serial issue as a whole, see FL 024 674.
PUB TYPE	Journal Articles (080) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
JOURNAL CIT	Working Papers in Educational Linguistics; v12 n2 p29-42 Fall 1996.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Business Administration Education; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Education; Educational Policy; Foreign Countries; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Intercultural Communication; *International Studies; Language Planning; *Language Role; Program Descriptions; Public Policy; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; *Second Languages
IDENTIFIERS	*Lauder Institute of Management Internatl Studies; National Defense Education Act Title VI; University of Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

Trends in the planning and teaching of ethnic and foreign languages in the United States are examined, and the Language and Cultural Perspectives program of the University of Pennsylvania's Lauder Institute, a graduate program in management and international studies, is presented as illustration of a successful program of foreign language education that supports global language planning. Literature on immigrant (ethnic) languages, language planning and maintenance, and Title VI of the National Defense Education Act are reviewed, and the way in which the Lauder Institute program responds to some central issues is examined. Program structure is described briefly, noting the combining of language instruction and cultural immersion in an overseas study experience, continued instruction integrating language, business and culture, and summer internship opportunities. Contains 34 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 409 736

Foreign Language Planning in U.S. Higher Education: The Case of a Graduate Business Program

Mitchell A. Furumoto

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

FL024676

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cheryl Donnelly

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Foreign Language Planning in U.S. Higher Education: The Case of a Graduate Business Program

Mitchell A. Furumoto

University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

This paper considers foreign language acquisition cultivation planning in U.S. higher education using the case of the Lauder Institute's Language and Cultural Perspectives Program, a graduate program in management and international studies. The Lauder case illustrates a successful program that is continously being developed to meet the needs of its students. The case is placed in perspective within the field of language planning through discussion of its relation to relevant theories and frameworks. In addition, views toward languages and the role of Title VI funding are considered in the historical and current multilingual context of the US.

The United States has been long known as a country of immigrants. At times, the diverse cultural backgrounds of its people have been valued and promoted to some degree. However, it has also long been called a melting pot, in which assimilation to the mainstream is expected. It seems that as long as their own cultural behaviors, practices, and beliefs remained on the periphery, ethnic minorities have been able to participate in mainstream society, at least marginally.

While the cultural backgrounds of ethnic minorities may be tolerated or accepted, as long as they do not conflict greatly with mainstream values, many have viewed the languages of immigrant minorities as a hindrance. Multilingualism, thus, has been viewed as a divisive force within U.S. society and the mainstream goal has been the eradication of immigrant languages or, at least, complete transition to English.

In this largely monolingual country, it is common for the transition to English within an immigrant family to be completed by the third generation (i.e., the second to be raised in the US) (Fishman (1966), cited in Garcia & Otheguy 1994: 101). In addition, we only need to look at the increasing

Table 1
Context of Two Different Frames of Language Planning in the US
(reproduced from Iino 1993: 102)

Ethnic Languages	Foreign Languages
Uses of Languages	
domestic	international
(majority vs. minority)	(dominance vs. subordination)
local	remote
(geographical space)	
immediate	non-immediate
(time)	(future oriented)
visible in daily life	invisible
	(problem itself foreign)
overt conflicts	covert conflicts
	(no lawsuit)
User of Languages	
low socioeconomic status	elite
elementary education	higher education
involuntary	voluntary
individual	institution
(drop out)	(loss of international competence)
Attitude Toward Languages	
subtractive	additive
(seen negative)	(seen positive)
unity as goal	diversity as goal

influence of the English Only Movement and the growing perceived threat of Spanish-speaking immigrants as well as other minority populations and their languages to understand that multilingualism is not a major goal for this country. In fact, it is commonly viewed as a problem for communicative and national unity, rather than an asset to further develop. (See Crawford 1992.)

Instead of taking advantage of its linguistic resources, the US tends to be a country of native monolinguals who learn foreign languages (FLs), languages which are "exogenous to the society" (Lambert 1990c: 1). Lambert makes an important distinction between these and the languages of immigrant minorities, which fit into his term ethnic languages (ELs). According to Lambert (p. 1), ELs are "used as mother tongues by important segments of the society" while FLs are not major languages within the society.

FLs (e.g., French, Castillian Spanish, and recently Japanese) have an international role and are not usually encountered in daily life in the US. They hold prestige for those who learn or speak them and are frequently

viewed favorably as additive; however, ELs (e.g., Cantonese Chinese, Spanish, as spoken by non-elite Latin American immigrants, and Japanese, as spoken by laborer immigrants who arrived pre-WWII) are usually the languages of immigrants with a lower socioeconomic status. ELs can be commonly encountered in the US. They hold little prestige for those who speak them, and are viewed negatively as impediments to national unity (adapted from Iino 1993: 101-104; see Table 1). However, the distinctions are not clear-cut. In the US situation, both Spanish and Japanese may be considered both FLs and ELs, but the main goals of teaching them outside heritage language communities and bilingual education have been for FL purposes, such as training, working, or studying in Spanish-speaking countries or with visiting nationals from such countries.

It may seem ironic that we exert an effort, albeit small, for monolinguals to learn FLs, while at the same time we discourage immigrants, who are native speakers of ELs, from maintaining their languages (cf. Lambert 1991b; Iino 1993: 104). Efforts of heritage language programs as well as of maintenance and enrichment bilingual education, have attempted to counteract the effects of policies and attitudes against EL maintenance (see Phillips 1990: 46-48). However, the current dominant view in the US seems to be toward the suppression and eradication of minority languages. Although the learning of FLs in the formal educational system is promoted, it is encouraged and supported to a limited extent.

With the distinction between ELs and FLs in mind, I draw upon Ruiz' (1984) orientations in language planning: language-as-problem, language-as-right, and language-as-resource, to discuss multilingualism in the US context, and later more specifically, foreign language acquisition cultivation planning in the case of the Language and Cultural Perspectives Program (LCP) of the Joseph H. Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies at the University of Pennsylvania. In the US, ELs can be discussed under all three of Ruiz' (1984) orientations in language planning. However, FLs can really only be considered under one: language-as-resource. Overall, the dominant orientation toward language diversity in this country is language-as-problem, as illustrated by the debate on bilingual education and the education of ethnolinguistic minority students.

Retention of ELs is seen as a barrier to social integration and unity within the US. The language-as-problem view has been used either against bilingual education, or when for it, only for transitional bilingual education "which aim[s] toward language shift, cultural assimilation, and social incorporation of language minorities in the national society" (Hornberger 1991: 222). Comparatively, the language-as-right view is used as one argument for maintenance bilingual education. It has also been used to support legislation to insure that one has access to voting, emergency services, social services, legal proceedings, and education, among others in one's own native language. This supports the notion that the use of one's own language is considered a basic human right. The third, the language-as-resource view,

has been used as an argument for both maintenance and enrichment bilingual education. Some proponents argue that learning in more than one language leads to better cognitive abilities, more access to information, and better understanding of other cultures.

On the other hand, FLs in the US are typically regarded as additional resources to be acquired by native monolingual English speakers. However, that has not always been the case. In fact, many colleges and universities have dropped or lowered their foreign language requirements for admission and graduation. This seems to demonstrate that FLs are not always considered to be important resources.

I consider the case of Lauder and other such cases in the US as cases that follow the language-as-resource orientation. Since ELs do not carry much prestige and are not considered major languages for international business, they have been viewed as part of the language-as-problem orientation, not as resources to be developed.[1] It is therefore fitting that they are not included in Lauder's LCP Program. The languages that are included are considered resources, especially since they are important languages for international business. The languages (all of which are FLs) include[2]: French, Spanish, Russian, Mandarin Chinese, Portuguese, Japanese, and German.

Situating the Lauder case

Traditionally, language planning has been viewed as planning to solve problems concerning language or communication (Cooper 1989: 35). However, Cooper, drawing on Karam (1974), emphasized that motivation for language planning is typically directed toward nonlinguistic ends, for example, those that are political, economic, or scientific in nature (p. 35). It is with this in mind that I consider foreign language acquisition cultivation planning in the US. It views "language planning not as efforts to solve language problems but rather as efforts to influence language behavior" because language and communication problems are not the only issues at hand (p. 35).

Expanding on the traditional distinctions between status and corpus types in language planning first made by Kloss (1969), Cooper (1989: 33) introduced another distinct category, acquisition planning. Acquisition planning is related to status planning in that its main concern is on language spread (p. 33). However, whereas the emphasis of status planning is on increasing the uses or functions of a language or language variety, the emphasis of acquisition planning is on increasing the number of speakers (p. 33). Acquisition planning is not concerned with corpus planning because it does not deal with actual changes in or planning of the language itself.

[1] See Garcia and Otheguy (1994) for a discussion of LOTEs and the important role ELs play as resources in the US in small businesses within minority communities.

[2] English as a second language is also included, but is not discussed herein because it is not an FL in the US and because it is not covered under Title VI, the federal funding.

Table 2
Cooper's preliminary framework for acquisition planning
(reproduced from Cooper 1989: 160)

		overt goal		
		acquisition	reacquisition	maintenance
chief focus of method employed to attain the goal	opportunity to learn			
	incentive to learn			
	both opportunity and incentive to learn			

Cooper's (1989: 160) preliminary framework (see Table 2) for acquisition planning contains two variables. The variables include the overt goal, which may be acquisition, reacquisition, or maintenance, and the chief focus of the method employed to attain the goal, which may be opportunity to learn, incentive to learn, or both opportunity and incentive to learn, thus providing nine categories. The planning case of Lauder will be related to the category in Cooper's framework defined by an overt goal of acquisition and the chief focus on opportunity and incentive to learn.

In addition to the distinction between status and corpus types, another traditional distinction in the language planning literature is made between policy and cultivation approaches (Neustupny (1974) cited in Hornberger 1994: 78-79). Whereas the policy approach is more macroscopic, with concerns at the societal or national level, on form of language(s), the cultivation approach is more microscopic with concerns about the function of language(s) (see Hornberger 1994: 78-79).

Hornberger's (1994: 78) integrative framework of language planning goals (Table 3) expands upon Haugen's (1972, 1983), which includes the distinction between status and corpus types and policy and cultivation approaches. To this she adds Cooper's (1989) acquisition type, thus providing six categories. The cultivation approach and acquisition type category of Hornberger's framework will also be related to the Lauder program.

In the case of Lauder, as with foreign languages in U.S. higher education in general, one of the main motivations behind planning seems to be global economic competitiveness. Much has been written about the importance of support and development of foreign language education in the US for purposes such as international relations, global competitiveness, and national security. (See, for example, Brecht & Walton 1994; Castro 1981;

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3
Language planning goals: An integrative framework
(reproduced from Hornberger 1994: 78)

Approaches	Policy Planning (on form) (on function)	Cultivation Planning
Types	Goals	Goals
Status Planning (about users of language)	Standardisation Status Officialisation Nationalisation Proscription	Revival Maintenance Interlingual Communication International Intranational Spread
Acquisition Planning (about users of language)	Group Education/School Literature Religion Mass Media Work	Reacquisition Maintenance Foreign Language/ Second Language Shift
Corpus Planning	Standardisation Corpus Auxilliary code Graphisation	Modernisation Lexical Stylistic Renovation Purification Reform Stylistic simplification Terminology unification

Flynn 1995; Foster 1985; Heller 1983; Lambert 1987, 1990b, 1992, 1994a, 1994b; Phillips 1990; Simon 1980; Tsongas 1981). In concordance with such thought, the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) has been working on a national plan for teaching languages other than English[3] (LOTEs), both within and outside of the formal educational system. This plan focuses on use-oriented needs, such as the needs of students in specific fields like business, science, and engineering in the US (Lambert 1989, 1991b). However, the adoption of such a plan would have to be elected by individual institutions since the federal government has little power over such decisions in higher education. On the other hand, federal funding does impact the shape of the programs it supports as will be illustrated by the Lauder case.

In the next section, the effects of federal support and governmental reactions to global politics and economics on foreign language teaching in the US since the late 1950s is discussed. The initiation of the National Defense

[3] I borrow the term from Garcia and Otheguy (1994) and use it to refer to both FLs and ELs, as they do.

Education Act (NDEA), specifically Title VI, is considered as it applies to foreign language teaching in higher education, and more specifically to the case of Lauder.

Title VI and foreign languages in higher education

After the surprise launching of Sputnik in 1957 by the Soviet Union, which was seen as a considerable threat to US security, attention became focused on a "perceived...foreign language crisis" (Lambert 1992: 6). The US had had no previous inkling that Sputnik was to be launched and the potential for future such events was seen as a threat. The US government realized that if more citizens knew Russian, and by extension other foreign languages, the US might be able to avoid such circumstances. Advanced knowledge from their new resource of people, competent in other languages, would prevent this (Grittner 1982; Lambert 1992; Moore 1994).

The post-Sputnik realization that a lack of foreign language competencies was a threat to national security was the impetus for the passing of the NDEA, including a provision for foreign language teaching known as Title VI. The NDEA Title VI was the first federal funding ever to deal specifically with foreign language instruction. It has provided support for many programs concentrating on foreign language and area studies, including the LCP Program at Lauder (Grittner 1982; Lambert 1992; Moore 1994). The objective of the NDEA was "to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the *national defense* [my emphasis] needs of the United States" (NDEA, cited in McDonnell, Berryman, & Scott 1981). The original focus of Title VI of the NDEA was the teaching and learning of foreign languages at advanced levels, especially non-Western European languages. Areas outside of Western Europe were considered critical for national security because they had the greatest lack of skilled specialists (Lambert 1992).

Soon after its inception, Title VI expanded to create centers for international studies, study abroad programs, foreign language and area fellowships, materials development and training for advanced foreign language teaching, as well as other projects related to foreign language and area studies (Lambert 1991a, 1992). Spanish, French, and German, particularly at the advanced levels, were also eventually included due to program demands and a change in congressional intent to include Western European languages (Lambert 1992: 7-8).

As Title VI continued to expand its dimensions of international area studies and to focus less on national defense, it increasingly emphasized global competitiveness, particularly economic competitiveness. It also began to include Latin America in 1960 and Western Europe in 1973 as areas to be studied. In 1980, Title VI of the NDEA was reauthorized under the Higher Education Act (HEA). It began to be administered under the Department of Education (DoE) and was no longer under the Department

of Defense. With the new focus on international competitiveness, links to graduate business schools were firmly established as a provision in Part B, Business and International Education Programs of Title VI of the HEA. Lauder became one of the permanent Resource Centers in International Management Education (RCIME) under Title VI in 1985, one year after it came into existence. (Lambert 1991a; Cowles 1993).

In the next section, the Lauder Institute through its promotion of FLs in its LCP Program is considered as a case in foreign language acquisition cultivation planning. The Lauder case is applied to relevant language planning frameworks and discussed in relation to Title VI of the HEA.

The Lauder case

As discussed earlier, Lauder's LCP Program can be seen in light of both Cooper's (1989) preliminary framework for acquisition planning and Hornberger's (1994) integrative framework of language planning goals. Using Cooper's framework, the overt goal is the acquisition of an FL at an advanced level that is important for business and management. This goal is reached by achieving a Superior level rating on the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) exam administered by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). This is required for graduation and considered the minimum level for professional proficiency. The chief focus of the method used to attain such a goal is both opportunity and incentive to learn.

Cooper's category of both opportunity and incentive to learn echo an earlier statement by Haugen: "Prestige must somehow be established and opportunity ("access") provided for those who wish to learn (1966: 65). Prestige is a great incentive to learn or at least participate in Lauder's LCP Program. It is anticipated that advanced language abilities will be well-regarded in the business world and therefore assets to students during job recruitment. As for opportunities to learn, they are extensive and spread throughout Lauder's two year program, as described below.

The program begins with a one month orientation at Lauder for all incoming students. The orientation includes intensive language and culture classes appropriate for the country and region of specialization. After orientation, students are grouped according to their languages of study and begin a two month summer language and cultural immersion in a country relevant to each language and area of focus. During each semester of the two year program, students attend approximately 55 hours of courses and specialized seminars which integrate language, business, and culture. These seminars are often led by native speaking guest professionals in business or government. After the first year, students have further opportunity to learn through expected participation in a summer internship in their area of focus. Additional incentive to attain a high proficiency level is a special language honors distinction at graduation for those who achieve higher than an ACTFL OPI Superior rating (above 3 on the Foreign Service

Institute scale).[4] However, the actual motivation instilled by this opportunity is questionable and students may not perceive other benefits beyond the distinction.

As applied to the Lauder case, Hornberger's (1994) framework, like that of Cooper (1989), would categorize Lauder's LCP Program as acquisition type planning with the additional definitional dimension of the cultivation approach. Lauder is, thus, an example of foreign language acquisition cultivation planning for higher education in the US. Its goals are to increase the number of FL users in the proficiency required for business and management and for these FL users to acquire higher skills and expanded functions to cover a wide range of social and professional contexts, including "substantial knowledge of the contemporary and traditional culture of educated native speakers of the language of study" (Lauder Institute 1995: 11). The number of users is increased through participation in the program while functions are expanded through the opportunities described above.

One of the main motivations behind planning in the Lauder case, and with current foreign language study in U.S. higher education in general, seems to be global economic competitiveness. Foreign language competencies are seen as resources, or as tools, for doing business abroad and with people of other countries. It should be stressed again that FL competencies and not EL competencies are promoted as resources. As discussed earlier, ELs are generally viewed under the language-as-right or language-as-problem orientation and only marginally as resources. On the other hand, FLs, when regarded at all, are generally considered as resources, as is the case with the languages taught at Lauder.

All of the languages (Spanish, Russian, Portuguese, Mandarin Chinese, French, German, and Japanese) included as part of Lauder's LCP Program are FLs that are considered critical languages. They are eligible for funding under Title VI because they are offered at advanced levels of instruction, they have large numbers of speakers, they are important for management, and they are considered strategic for international business. German, for instance, is included because it is an important language of management and business in the former Eastern Bloc countries where economic development is growing. (M. A. Cowles, personal communication, March 28, 1996).

As mentioned earlier, Lauder was awarded Title VI funding in 1985 as one of only a few Resources Centers in International Management Education (RCIME). It teaches foreign languages critical for management and business

---

[4] The ACTFL scale is based on the FSI scale, but only rates 3 levels instead of 5 as does the FSI scale. The ACTFL OPI is intended for mainly academic purposes which do not usually need to make a distinction above level 3/Superior. In addition, whereas the FSI scale and the lower levels on the ACTFL scale make distinctions between low, mid, and high, the Superior ACTFL level does not.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

purposes as part of its LCP Program within its overall dual MBA/MA program. In addition to teaching advanced level critical languages, Lauder, as an RCIME, provides outreach services both in the local community and worldwide. For example, the LCP Program staff and faculty give presentations and workshops on curriculum design, program creation, assessment, and implementation for advanced language skills, especially for professional business purposes. As an RCIME, Lauder is expected to develop new models for advanced language teaching. (M. A. Cowles, personal communications, March 26 & 28, 1996). In this regard, at least, Lauder and other RCIMEs influence the federal government, or the DoE, in setting the policy for funding requirements of other programs receiving funding under Title VI.

In sum, it may be helpful to summarize the Lauder case in terms of the question, "*Who* plans *what* for *whom* and *how*?" (Cooper 1989: 31). Planning is done at the federal level by the DoE from which Title VI funds are disseminated. Additional influence is brought to bear by organizations such as the NFLC, ACTFL, and Title VI's own RCIMEs with regard to program design, evaluation and focus of instruction (which is moving toward content-based and use-oriented instruction) (cf., Lambert 1991b, 1992; M. A. Cowles, personal communication, March 28, 1996). As a result, actual planning for foreign language acquisition cultivation in US higher education stems from these agencies. This level of control is regulated though by a reliance on Title VI grants which are reviewed for renewal every three years.

What is planned in this case is foreign language acquisition and cultivation, for graduate students of business and international studies in the LCP Program. Planning for advanced competency in languages which are designated as important for business and management means that FL competency is seen as an added resource. The planning decisions are primarily implemented on the local level by the program director and language instructors. The main goal of Title VI is for advanced level language training related to business, but much of how that is achieved is left to the individual programs, especially at the RCIMEs such as Lauder. One language assessment measure for program and student success, used by Lauder and approved under Title VI, is the use of the ACTFL OPI exam (cf. Lambert, 1992; M. A. Cowles, personal communication, March 28, 1996).

Outcomes of the planning in this case are generally successful, but the results are somewhat more complicated. These are discussed in the following section.

Conclusion

Globalization, *global economy*, and *global village* are currently very fashionable buzzwords in business and many other professions. The Lauder Institute is one example of the attempt by U.S. graduate business schools to provide their students with the language, business, and cultural training necessary to work successfully with native speakers as well as in foreign

countries. In fact, a recent article in *International Business* magazine depicted Lauder graduates with their international training as some of the most sought after business school graduates by major worldwide companies (1995: 26). This alone as a measure would seem to indicate at least general success of Lauder's program. However, the foreign language competencies of U.S. students may not be as highly valued for international companies as one might expect.

More often than not international companies would rather hire a person native to a certain region or country who has been educated in the US rather than a person from the US who has strong language, business, and cultural competencies appropriate for the region or country in question. When U.S. business persons are selected for assignments abroad, language fluency and cultural sensitivity are often not factors. Lauder is an example of the attempt business schools are making to reverse this trend. However, a change in attitudes held by the companies who hire graduates is necessary for this to happen. (cf., Lambert 1980, 1990a).

Lauder's students themselves must also perceive their advanced language and cultural competencies as important in order to fully regard this case of foreign language acquisition cultivation planning as successful. According to a survey carried out by the NFLC (Lambert 1993), by the end of their two-year program, many Lauder students valued only their MBA courses and considered the MA portion of their program irrelevant to their future careers. As for the LCP Program component, students have also been known to give it secondary importance after their business courses. In fact, two of the instructors have claimed that their objectives have had to be changed to meet their students' needs of maintaining their language levels at Superior, once they reach it, instead of enhancing their skills beyond it ([Teacher A], [Teacher B], Spring, 1996, personal communications).

While it may be true that the language improvement effort levels of students decline after they reach Superior ratings, it is also true that the main goal of getting students to reach Superior ratings is achieved. However, a Superior rating is considered the minimum threshold level for professional communication and students should be instructed and encouraged to go beyond that (M. A. Cowles, March 28, 1996, personal communication). Changes in the LCP Program to promote this are currently underway. For example, during the Fall, 1996 term, a new advanced class has been offered only to students who have attained a Superior rating, in order further enhance their language abilities. Plans are currently underway to offer similar options for the other languages for the following term (R. Díaz, personal communication, October 17, 1996).

It thus seems just to consider the LCP Program as a successful case in foreign language acquisition cultivation planning. It may not be the ideal, but as with any successful and innovative program, modifications are continuously being made. In fact, the LCP Program is considered a model program for use-oriented foreign language instruction, which is the

current direction promoted by the NFLC with the support of several national foreign language associations (Lambert, 1991b; M. A. Cowles, personal communication, March 28, 1996).

On many campuses today, traditional language courses offered by language and literature departments are not meeting the use-oriented needs of students in other fields, such as business, science, and medicine. Some business schools actually incorporate proprietary language schools, such as Berlitz, into their programs instead of turning toward their own campus resources (cf. Lambert 1994a: 51). Lauder's LCP Program offers an example of a successful program of foreign language acquisition cultivation planning in U.S. higher education which continuously develops and revises use-oriented instruction to meet the needs of its own students. Other such programs do exist and are growing, but the US still lags behind much of the world in teaching, learning, and promoting the use of foreign languages. However, the collaboration of the NFLC, model programs such as Lauder's LCP Program, and other organizations to construct a kind of national plan for use-oriented language instruction in the US is one step toward catching up and remaining competitive with the rest of the world. This collaboration is productive, in part, because it offers the influences of different perspectives.

Language instruction in higher education is undergoing rapid changes to meet the diverse and growing needs of its students. Further efforts should be made to include ELs as valued resources for U.S. society (cf. Lambert 1994a). In addition, campus resources should be pooled together to meet the needs of all students so there is collaboration of perspective and efforts on the local level to meet students' use-oriented needs in different fields. At the University of Pennsylvania, such a process has begun through the efforts of another program called the Penn Language Center. Its primary goal is to teach what are known as the less commonly taught languages of the world (H. Schiffman, PLC meeting, March 21, 1996). Tracking the development of such collaborations at the University of Pennsylvania and other universities over time is needed in order to demonstrate their levels of success and continue to make progress in the area of language and cultural development.

References

Brecht, R. D. & Walton, A. R. (1994). National strategic planning in the less commonly taught languages. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 532:* 190-211.

Castro, R. E. (1981). *Meeting America's language needs: Foreign language teaching and bilingual education* (NIE-P-81-0053). National Institute of Education, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 720).

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cowles, M. A. (1993, April). *Discussion of the design and implementation of the Lauder content-based curriculum: Practical and theoretical considerations.* Paper presented at the Eleventh Annual Eastern Michigan University Conference on Languages and Communication for World Business and the Professions, Ypsilanti, MI.

Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue: Bilingualism and the politics of "English Only".* New York: Addison-Wesley.

Flynn, P. (March/April 1995). Global competition and education: Another Sputnik? *The Social Studies,* 53-55.

Foster, C. R. (1985). Bilingualism, foreign languages and universities. *NABE Journal, 9* (3), 1-4.

Garcia, O. & Otheguy, R. (1994). The value of speaking a LOTE in U. S. business. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 532:* 99-122.

Grittner, F. M. (1982). *Teaching issues in foreign language education: Current status and future directions for research.* National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 711).

Haugen, E. (1966). Linguistics and language planning. In W. Bright (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 50-71). The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton.

Heller, P. (1983). The neglect of foreign languages in the United States. In E. Dudley & P. Heller (Eds.), *American attitudes toward foreign languages and foreign cultures* (pp. 7-19). Bonn, Germany: Bouvier.

Hornberger, N. H. (1991). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In O. Garcia (Ed.), *Bilingual education: Focusschrift in honor of Joshua A. Fishman on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (Vol. 1, pp. 215-234). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hornberger, N. H. (1994). Literacy and language planning. *Language and Education, 8* (1-2): 75-86.

Iino, M. (1993). Language-as-resource for whom? Foreign language planning in higher education: Its goals and implementation. *Seikai no Nihongo Kyouiku,* 3: 99-119.

Ioannou, L. (August, 1995). Reinventing the MBA. *International Business,* 26-33.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report.* Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Lambert, R. D. (1987). The improvement of foreign language competency in the United States. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 490:* 9-19.

Lambert, R. D. (1989). The national foreign language system. *NFLC Occasional Papers,* 113-127.

Lambert, R. D. (1990a). Foreign language use among international business graduates. *The American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 511:* 47-59.

Lambert, R. D. (1990b). *Language instruction for undergraduates in American higher education.* Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center, Johns Hopkins University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 053).

Lambert, R. D. (1990c). Language policy: An international perspective. *NFLC Occasional Papers, 8:* 1-9.

Lambert, R. D. (1991a). *History and future of HEA Title VI.* Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center, Johns Hopkins University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 365 095).

Lambert, R. D. (1991b). *A national plan for a use-oriented foreign language system.* Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center, Johns Hopkins University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335 872).

Lambert, R. D. (1992). *Foreign language planning in the United States.* Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center, Johns Hopkins University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 805).

Lambert, R. D. (1993). International education and international competency in the United States. In S. J. Moore & C. A. Morfit (Eds.), *Language and international studies.* Washington, DC: National Foreign Language Center, Johns Hopkins University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 365 093).

Lambert, R. D. (1994a). Problems and processes in US foreign language planning. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 532:* 46-58.

Lambert, R. D. (1994b). Some issues in language policy for higher education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 532:* 123-137.

Lauder Institute. *Student Handbook: 1995-1997.*

McDonnell, L. M., Berryman, S. E. & Scott, D. (1981). *Federal support for international studies: The role of NDEA Title VI* (R-27770-ED). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 158).

Moore, S. J. (1994). Intervention strategies in foreign language planning. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 532:* 74-87.

Phillips, J. K. (1990). Language instruction in the United States: Policy and planning. In D. W. Birckbichler (Ed.), *New Perspectives and new directions in foreign language education* (pp. 45-75). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal, 8* (2): 15-34.

Simon, P. (1980). The U. S. crisis in foreign language. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 449:* 31-44.

Tsongas, P. E. (1981). Foreign languages and America's interests. *Foreign Language Annals, 14* (2): 115-119.

Mitchell Furumoto is a Ph.D. candidate in educational linguistics. His research interests include issues related to second and foreign language teaching and learning; international education; and language planning and policy. He has worked at the Lauder Institute as a language instructor and is currently working as a study abroad assistant at the University of Pennsylvania's Office of International Programs.

Acknowledgments

I gratefully acknowledge Maria Antonia (Toni) Cowles for her encouragement and for the time she gave to answering my questions and discussing the case with me. I also wish to thank Dr. Nancy Hornberger for her comments on the initial version of this paper which was written for her research seminar in language planning and education.